

Application No. 10/809,392  
Response dated: April 19, 2006  
Reply to Office action of January 20, 2006

**AMENDMENTS TO DRAWINGS**

Please replace originally filed Figures 4 and 5 with the two (2) Replacement Drawing Sheets appended hereto.

Application No. 10/809,392  
Response dated: April 19, 2006  
Reply to Office action of January 20, 2006

## **REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action dated January 20, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-10 are pending in the present Application. Claims 1, 2, 8 and 9 are amended and Claims 3 and 10 are withdrawn, leaving Claims 1, 2 and 4-9 for consideration upon entry of the present amendments and following remarks.

Support for the amendments to the claims is at least found in the specification, the figures, and the claims as originally filed. More particularly, support for amended Claims 1 and 8 is at least found in originally filed Figure 2.

No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

### **Drawings**

The Examiner indicates that Figures 4 and 5 should be designated "Prior Art" because only that which is old is illustrated. In reply, Applicants hereby submit corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.121(d). The amended drawing sheet includes all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet. The replacement sheets are labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 C.F.R. §1.84(c)). Reconsideration of the corrected drawings sheets is respectfully requested.

### **Specification**

The Examiner indicates that the title of the invention is not descriptive and that a new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Applicants respectfully submit that the current title of the invention is descriptive and clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed and request the Examiner to provide suggested language for a title of the invention.

Application No. 10/809,392  
Response dated: April 19, 2006  
Reply to Office action of January 20, 2006

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 2, 3, 9 and 10 are objected to because of informalities. Particularly, the claims refer to “the edges of the common electrode line and the pixel electrode line,” but there are two edges of each, and they are not parallel to each other. The Examiner has indicated that these claims are being considered as referring to the “first edge.” Claims 3 and 10 are further objected to because “makes clockwise obtuse angles” in line 3 of the claims should be “makes counterclockwise obtuse angles.”

In response, Applicants have amended pending Claims 2 and 9 accordingly, to include “first edges.” Claims 3 and 10 are withdrawn from consideration and therefore Applicants have not amended these claims at this time. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the relevant claim objections are respectfully requested.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 8 and 9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated Suzuki et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,905,556 (hereinafter “Suzuki”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Amended Claims 1 and 8 recite, *inter alia*,

“...a common electrode and a source electrode formed on the first substrate;  
a common electrode line connected to the common electrode and making an obtuse angle with the common electrode;  
a pixel electrode formed on the first substrate and alternately arranged with the common electrode; and  
a pixel electrode line connected to the pixel electrode and making an obtuse angle with the pixel electrode.”

The Examiner considers common electrode (CE) and source electrode (S) of Suzuki as disclosing the common electrode and pixel electrode, respectively, of the claimed invention. (See, Item 6. on Page 3 of the Office Action.)

- Application No. 10/809,392
- Response dated: April 19, 2006
- Reply to Office action of January 20, 2006

In an non-limited exemplary embodiment of the claimed invention, the present invention illustrates in Figure 2 and further describes in the specification at the noted paragraphs common electrode lines 131 including common electrodes 133 [0031], data lines 171 separate from pixel electrode lines 191 [0039], the pixel electrode lines 191 including the pixel electrodes 190 [0040], the pixel electrodes 190 being parallel and between the common electrodes 133 [0040] and the data lines 171 forming source electrodes 173 [0041]. Particularly, it is the pixel electrode that is alternately arranged with the common electrode recited in Claims 1 and 8. Applicants find no disclosure in Suzuki of a common electrode, a source electrode *and* a pixel electrode as claimed. Therefore, Suzuki does not at least disclose a common electrode, a source electrode and a pixel electrode formed on the first substrate, the pixel electrode alternately arranged with the common electrode of amended Claims 1 and 8.

Thus, Suzuki fails to disclose all of the limitations of amended Claims 1 and 8. Accordingly, Suzuki does not anticipate amended Claims 1 and 8. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 8 are not further rejected or objected and are therefore allowable. Claims 2, 4 and 9 depend from Claims 1 and 8, are not further rejected or objected and are correspondingly allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1, 2, 4, 8 and 9 are respectfully requested.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Suzuki in view of Ono et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,774,956 (hereinafter “Ono”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art and that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Amgen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

Claims 5-7 depend from Claim 1 and inherit all of the limitations of Claim 1. As discussed above, Suzuki fails to teach all of the limitations of amended Claim 1.

Application No. 10/809,392  
Response dated: April 19, 2006  
Reply to Office action of January 20, 2006

Ono is relied upon as teaching the pixel electrode and common electrode are curved. Applicants find no disclosure of a common electrode, a source electrode and a pixel electrode formed on the first substrate, the pixel electrode alternately arranged with the common electrode as claimed. Therefore, Ono fails to remedy the deficiencies of Suzuki with respect to the limitations of Claims 5-7.

Suzuki and Ono, alone in or combination fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of Claims 5-7. Accordingly, *prima facie* obviousness does not exist regarding Claims 5-7 with respect to Suzuki and Ono.

Additionally, since Suzuki and Ono fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of Claims 5-7, clearly, one of ordinary skill at the time of Applicants' invention would not have a motivation to modify the reference, nor a reasonable likelihood of success in forming the claimed invention by the Examiner's suggestion of modifying the reference. Thus, here again, *prima facie* obviousness does not exist. *Id.*

Thus, *prime facie* obviousness does not exist regarding Claims 5-7 with respect to Suzuki and Ono. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 5-7 are not further rejected or objected and are therefore allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 5-7 are respectfully requested.

### Conclusion

All of the objections and rejections are herein overcome. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. No new matter is added by way of the present Amendments and Remarks, as support is found throughout the original filed specification, claims and drawings. Prompt issuance of Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

\* Application No. 10/809,392  
Response dated: April 19, 2006  
Reply to Office action of January 20, 2006

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' attorney at the below listed phone number regarding this response or otherwise concerning the present application.

Applicants hereby petition for any necessary extension of time required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) or 1.136(b) which may be required for entry and consideration of the present Reply.

If there are any charges due with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: Amy Bizon-Copp  
Amy Bizon-Copp  
Reg. No. 53,993  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Date: April 19, 2006